

REMARKS

Claim 8 has been amended to include indented sections for the “allowing step”, and to require that the display, in addition to displaying role players and discussion threads, also displays resources relevant to the context the first user is working in. Support for this amendment can be found in on page 3, lines 26-27.

All claims stand rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0018719 to Ruths in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0167344 to Dango.

In making the rejection, the Examiner has highlighted paragraph [0137] of Ruths. It is noted that this paragraph deals with two people sharing the same resource (e.g., an X-ray image). With reference to Figure 28, the two different client viewers 26, using adapters 24, can jointly view or modify patient images. In the office action, multiple images have been erroneously equated to different projects and this has been further equated to different contexts. This is not the case. As noted in paragraph [0137] the images are the “collaborative resources” shared in the “collaborative environment”.

In contrast, in the application, on page 6, at line 10 stated that “Contexts are mechanisms to scope resource relationships, including relationships between collaboration elements and business operational artifacts.” This statement clearly describes that a context contains multiple resources as it is a mechanism to scope resource relationships. In Ruths’ application, a single image can only be considered as one resource, and resource relationships does not exist within a single resource, therefore, a single image cannot be equated to the definition of a context. In addition, on page 11, at lines 11 et seq., it is described by example how a user can work on different resources (e.g., documents) which can be present in different contexts (e.g., different projects---project A and B) without leaving a user’s development environment (e.g., a user can work on a document in project B after having started working on a document in project A). In this scenario, the user gains access to different resources for supporting the collaboration. With reference to Figure 3 of the application, it can be seen that,

based on actions taken by the user, the context that the user is working is determined, and if the action taken is significant the displayed view for collaboration space is changed. Ruths does not contemplate adding or deleting a resource and a relationship to or from said context. Rather, Ruths permits two or more people to work on or review one or more images simultaneously; however, the user does not change contexts in Ruths.

Further, as noted previously, while paragraph [0137] discusses the clinicians being able to share views of the image and to discuss those views orally by VoIP, these actions do not involve role players and discussion threads in a collaboration space, and do not involve gaining access to resources in the context said first user is working in without said first user having to leave said first user's development environment as is required in claim 8.

Further, similar to paragraph [0137], Ruths shows sharing a resource (e.g., data in a spreadsheet) on three different types of devices (see paragraph [0085]). The parties that are operating the different devices are sharing the resource, but Ruths does not contemplate a user gaining access to other resources in his or her context without having to switch to a different collaboration application (as is required in claim 8). Since Ruths only dealt with users sharing one resource, regardless of what users' actions may be, all the users are sharing the same resource, and no other resources are displayed or affected. In paragraph [0134] of Ruths' publication states that "The collaborative platform on System A may then send a state update to the collaborative environment of system B to update the client data representation spreadsheet. Thus, changes to the collaborative spreadsheet are synchronized between the participants". Therefore, Ruths' publication has clearly indicated that the collaborative environment only contains one resource, not multiple resources as we described in our application.

Further, as noted previously Ruths do not show "capturing a user action in a development environment and determining a context associated with said user action" or "displaying in a graphical user interface display window content of a collaboration space relevant to a current development context" is valid because Ruths' publication only has

one resource in a collaborative environment, and there is no mechanism necessary to determine other resources associated with a context when a user takes different action. In Raths' publication, regardless of what action each user takes, the resource displayed is "synchronized between participants".

Danso has been cited for its teachings related to communication among various parties (e.g., teacher-student, Internet trading), and Danso describes exchanges of communication protocols at a number of nodes, and derivation of routing paths through the nodes. Danso has been particularly relied upon as showing a discussion thread. In paragraph [0057] of Danso's publication, it describes a "management interface IG could ensure the functions of a server and administrator and network exchange manager, both as regards the communication network RC (which can for example use the Internet network) and the network (for example Intranet) linking the various approved partners." This paragraph clearly states that Danso's interface focuses on the linking various partners together. It does not focus on monitoring each user's action. Danso does not describe a collaborative venture among different subjects where they are each working in different contexts using different resources.

Based on this, among other deficiencies, Raths and Danso do not show "capturing a user action in a development environment and determining a context associated with said user action" (see step 32 in Figure 3)

"displaying in a graphical user interface display window content of a collaboration space relevant to a current developer context" (emphasis added)

"said current developer context including role players, discussion threads, and resources relevant to the context the first user is working in"

As noted on page 10, line 24 et seq., "The Monitor is a middleman behind the screen that listens to the actions of the user in his development environment and interfaces with CollabManager 14, ContextManager 15 and the Viewer 21 if the actions of the user are significant enough to change the current set of resources being displayed in the Viewer 21 if the user has enabled context sensitivity for the Viewer". In addition to

the reasons noted above, as these features are missing from both references, no combination of the two references would make the claimed invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the above, claims 8, 10, 14, and 20-23 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date is requested.

Applicants hereby make a written conditional petition for extension of time, if required. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Applicants' Deposit Account No. 50-0510 (IBM Corporation).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Whitham
Registration No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis Christofferson & Cook, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, Virginia 20190
Tel. (703) 787-9400
Fax. (703) 787-7557

Customer No: 30743